G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

1915.

(Anzeai)

File No. 416-15

Serial Nos. 1-5

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1-5

Part B for June 18.

G. O. No. 3506—Muz. 416-15-4, dated 18th June 1918.

Archakship of Sri Pattabhi Rama Devaru Temple at Paschimavahini and Ammanavara Sannidhi Paricharike of Sri Lakshminarasimha Swami Temple at Seringapatam.

W D 88—GPB—50,000—24-7-18

ashraf.

G. R. S. 11] 1915.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Inwards)

NOTES.

File No. 416-15

FILE HEADING.

Archakship of Pattabhirama Devaru Temple at Paschimavahini -

From

M. A. Ramanujiengar Son of Annaswami Tirunarayiengar.

~~No.~~ Petition Dated 4-9-1915 Received .

Diary No. 449	Enclos. 1	Spare Copies.	Serial No. 1

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Advances his hereditary claim to the Archakship of Sri Pattabhirama Devaru Temple at Paschimavahini as well the ~~appointment of Sri Ranganatha Swami Temple.~~ Ammanavaru Sannidhi Paricharike of Sri Lakshmi Narasimha Swami Temple at Srirangapatna.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

This is a petition from Ramanujiengar, clerk in the Archaeological office, appealing against the Mysore Dy. Comm's order (Communicated through the Taluk Huzur,

NOTES—First Sheet.

GPB 4/20,100 8-5-14

Serial No.

directing the pets to report himself for duty at Pachumavahini failing which his banaward will be Cancelled and a substitute appointed in his stead. the petition is duly Stamped. the Builder's notice Conveying the Dy. Comms' order is dated 4th may 1915 while the appeal petition is dated 9th September 1915. the appellant states that owing to domestic Calamity and other Causes, there was some delay for filing the appeal which he begs to be excused. He advances his hereditary claims to the appointment of Sri Ranganatha Swami Temple also. It is not clear to what post he claims

2 Submtd. with a draft calling for report with records

NW 1857 ann
27.1.1916 29/1/16

ann
1/2/16

2/3/16 D C Mysore dt 1864 dd 7.2.1916.

Forward the above for report with records

Ent to Peshkar 10 1865 dd 7/2/16

NOTE—Contn. sheet

WD 1283—GPB—60,000—1 12-16—S.

3

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. 416 of 191 5.

Serial No.

3 4 From, the Dy. Commr, Mysore Dist
Letter no 31 Dy 8 9 1917.
Submits report with records called for in Sl. 2.

5 The facts of the case are clearly given in Kannada memo in the record Dy 1st April 1915 and 8 November 1915, on which the Dy. Commr has passed his original order.

(Pages A, B)

6 The dispute relates to 2 appointments viz Annamanavara Sannidhi Paricharike of Sri Lakshmi Narasimha Swami Temple at Seringapatam and Archakship of Pattabhi Rama Devara Temple attached to Nowl Krishna Doss charities at Paschimavahini the karawaddar Srinivasiengar died on 24th Jany. 1915, and his Son M. A. Ramanujiengar claims both the posts on the ground that they are hereditary in his family. The Dy Commr has directed that Ramanujiengar should report himself for duty within the stipulated period of 3 months, failing which his karawad will be cancelled.

Ramanujiengar has appealed

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

WD 1283—GPB—60,000—1 12-16—S.

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. 476 of 191 S.

Serial No.

to Sub. praying that as he is clerk in the Archæological office, Bangalore, he may be permitted to get the duties performed by a Sumasthan nominated by him -

8 As regards the Sannidhi Paricharike post in question, the Amildar seems to have assumed that this is a hereditary post. (Vide Amildar's report dt 15 2. 1915). The Secretary has expressed doubts about the hereditary nature of temple Paricharak posts. (Vide remarks in Melkote Bettada Sannidhi Paricharike file)

9 The matter may if so directed, be either reserved for personal inquiry at Seringapatam or the Dy. Commr may be directed to examine the documents in the possession of the appellant and submit a further report for orders of Govt -

10 Submitted for orders.

M (S3) 5-11-17 10/11/17

11 The point for consideration is whether the bearing of the post carries with it the responsibility of officiating as an invariable consequence - the

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

WD 1233—GPB—60 000—1 12-16—S

(2)

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. 416 of 191 5

Serial No.

Case may be decided on perusal of records

KB
10 11 17

17) The latitude now given to the appointment of gumastas has assumed serious proportions and if the principle is accepted unconditionally it is bound to ~~become~~ tell upon the efficiency of service. For example out of 54 hereditary appointments in the Baramahal list of Srirangapatanam temple at Seringapatam as many as 20 posts are held by gumastas who pay varying sums to the Haldars. The case does not appear to any better at either Melkote or Nanjangud though the figures have not yet been analysed.

13) Apart from the fact that the gumastas are men of less responsible with nothing like a secure tenure of office their emoluments which are already insufficient are further curtailed by the allowance which they have to give to the Baramahal with the result that the class of efficient

NOTE—Contn. sheet

WD 1233—GPB—60,000—1 12-16—S

(6)

R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. 416 of 191 5

Serial No.

Secured for the place is far from satisfactory while the same man comes to hold a number of inconsistent offices

14) As a general question the matter will be submitted for orders in connection with the revising establishment in the Seringapatam temple. In the present case, the appellant must be two to select between the two offices as directed by the Council. The usage has been different in a large number of cases up to now but a change in the policy is called for in the ready determination in temple services in the interests of the case may be posted for hearing 4.12.17

15) 1st member)

Post. for hearing
26.
KB
26/12/17

Posted to 9.4.1918 16) Notice to apltt Srinivas.

17) Appellant present and heard. Orders reserved. B.O.

KB.
16/4/18

NOTE—Contn sheet

ND 1233– GPB—60 000—1 12-16—S.

(7

G S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | Mercy File No. 416 of 1915.

Serial No.

Order.

(8) The Appellate Authority while hearing the two appointments together, the 'Bernard' theory in the first place. It seems scarcely fair or equitable to depute him, as he has, to be present with Clerks employed by those appointed himself, while doing nothing in a great many other Cases. If the time rules were made so that officials should be allowed proper substitutes during the period of their absence on duty. It is the duty of the Appellate Authority to see that Cases are not unduly delayed. And so long as the Appellate Authority does not know what posts are to be filled up, and what they are, it cannot expect the 'Bernard' will have to [illegible] appointments [illegible] in the hearings, which is often very inconvenient to the parties. So long as the [illegible] is no good reason to [illegible] 'Bernard' himself [illegible] the [illegible] to be present [illegible]

NOTE—Contn sheet

WD 1233—GPB—60 000—1 12-16—S

(8

-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | Army File No. 416 of 1915.

Serial No

4077
13/5

19 Note the general question of the
[illegible] remarks [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible]
[illegible]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Mer File.N 416 of 191 5

Serial No.	
4. 23)	Lo. D.C. Nipane. 3 06 Dt 18.6.18 Passes orders re the above directing that so long as the puja is performed dates by the substitute, the land mentioned need not be disturbed
5 24)	3507 Dt 18.6.18 Informs the petitioner of the above Re-Submitted with ref to para 19 Supra

M 26-6-18

NOTE—Contn sheet

WD A 1789—GPB—60,000—20 3 19—S.

DIARY No 449

19/5/19 16

SECTION Mem 2

TWO RUPEE

To

D.M. Narasinga Rao, Esquire, B.A., B.L.,

Secretary to the Government of

His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,

General Department, B A N G A L O R E.

Respected Sir,

herein enclosed for reference

I beg to appeal against the orders @ of the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District, stating that, unless I report myself for duty at Paschimavahini within three months of the - date of the order communicated to me, my baravard will be cancelled and that a substitute will be appointed instead

THE GROUNDS OF APPEAL ARE:-

1. That after the death of my father Annaswamy Tirunarana Iyengar, I am the Hakdar for the appointment referred to as - admitted by the Deputy Commissioner as well as of the appointment at the Sri Panganathaswamy Temple.

2. I am holding an appointment in the Archaeological Office, here, and it is difficult to take up the appointments at Paschima Vahini and at Seringapatam. In all such cases Government have been gracious enough to allow Cumastas being appointed and the duties being discharged by them.

3. The three months' time allowed by the Deputy Commissioner is too short a period for coming to any definite conclusion in this respect and considering my present circumstances it is -

inconvenient

inconvenient and difficult to accept the decision of the Deputy Commissioner.

4. It is submitted that the cause of the delay in preferring the appeal is due to the difficulty of getting at the documentary evidence, for which I beg to be excused. As my father died of plague and as I had to leave the house abruptly, the documents which I wished to produce could not be had easily The same will be produced in due course.

5. As I am the Hakdar of the two appointments and as my present circumstances do not permit to take up the two appointments, I humbly request once again that I may be kindly permitted to appoint a Gumasta for the discharge of the duties referred to.

6. In these circumstances I beg to state that the decision of the Deputy Commissioner in the matter is very harsh and inequitable.

7. I therefore pray that your honour will be so good as to revise the order of the Deputy Commissioner and permit me to appoint a Gumasta.

For which act of grace and kindness I shall be ever grateful.

I beg to remain,
Pespected Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
Mia Ramanuja Iyengar

B A N G A L O P E
9th September 1915

GOVT. OF H. H. THE MAHARAJA
OF MYSORE.

GEN. & REV. SECRETARIAT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

No 1864 Conf 7.2.16.
Mus 416-15-2

The accompanying Petition Registered

No 4469 dated 9-9-1915

received at the General and Revenue Secretariat from M. R. Ramanujiengar son of Rama Samy Tirumana Iyengar advancing his hereditary claims to the Archakship of Sri Pattabhi-Rama Dewaru Temple at Paschimavahini as well as the appointment of Sri Ranganatha Swamy Temple,

is forwarded, together with its enclosure one to the Dy. Commr Mysore Dist for report with records.

By Order,

1.2.16
Secretary.

BANGALORE,
_____191 .

P. T. O.

W D 682 -GPB—1 000—10 11 15

7 2 1916

ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರ [illegible] ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು

[illegible] ಹೊಬಳಿ

[illegible] ಗ್ರಾಮದಲ್ಲಿರುವ

[illegible]

ಇಂಡಾರ್ಸ್ಮೆ ಹುಕುಂ.

[illegible]

~~ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನೀವು ಗಮನಿಸಬಹುದಾಗಿ ಕೋರಿದೆ~~

~~ನ ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರನ~~ ಬಗ್ಗೆ

[illegible]

ರವಾನೆ ಬಗೆಗೆ ತಿಳುಹಿಸಿದೆ.

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು

By Order,

12 16

Secretary

24/16

MUZRAI
11 SEP 1917
DIARY No. 427
19/12-18
SECTION Mcd
FILE No. 416-15
SE 3

0 SEP 1917 1917

From

The Assistant Commissioner

in District Charge, Mysore

To

The Joint Secretary to Govt.,
Muzrai Department,
Bangalore.

Dated 8th September 1917.

Despatched 8th September 1917

Received

General No.

No.

Enclosure No.

Submits report with records re Archakship of Sri Pattabirama Devaru at Paschimavahani as well as Sri Ranganathaswami temple at Seringapatam.

Office of the Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District.
Dated, Mysore, 8th September 1917.

From

T. Rayaloo Chetty, Esquire,
Assistant Commissioner
in District Charge, Mysore.

To

C. Aravamudu Iyengar, Esquire, B.A., B.L.,
Joint Secretary to the Government of His
Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Judicial Department, Bangalore.

Adverting to your Official Memorandum No. 1864 Muz. 416-15-2 dated 7th February.1916 calling for report with records on the appeal petition presented by M.A. Ramanujiengar, son of Annasamy -- Tirumarana Iyengar advancing his hereditary claims to the archakship of SRI Pattabhirama Devaru temple at Paschimvahani as well as the appointment of Sri Ranganathaswami Temple at Seringapatam against the order of this office, I have the honor to submit herewith the entire records received with French Rocks Sub Division Officer's Yadi No.33 dated 19th July 1917 and to state that the facts of the case are detailed in this office Kanarese Memos and orders passed ~~and~~ by my predecessor Mr. A. Subramanya Iyer on 1st April and 8th November 1915.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant.

8-9-917

Assistant Commissioner
in District Charge,
Mysore.

A.N.

వేలం నోటీసు

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

3 Copies

Before the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

1918

Appeal No. 12 of 1917-18

Appellant. ~~Respondent~~

M. A Ramanujiengar Son of
Inna Sami Srinarniengar.

Jgs B J)

Subject. Appeal against Dy. Commrs. orders nos. 924 and 925 Dy 3rd April 1915 Re Archakship of Sri Pattabhi-Rama Devara Temple at Paschimavahini, and the Ammanavara Samnidhi Parichanike of Sri Lakshmi Nara Simha Swami Temple at Seringapatam.

Decision

The case was heard on 16th April 1918, the appellant being present in person.

The aplt is admittedly the "Archakar" to the two appointments in question

GPB—1,000—8-8-11

standing in
the name of his father.
It seems ~~seem~~ scarcely
fair or equitable to deprive
him of his "hak" on the
ground that he is not
able to perform the duties
appertaining to these offices
himself, while allowing
substitutes in a great many
other cases. It is time
rules were made as to
what appointments proper
~~appointments~~ substitutes
may be allowed for and
what not. It is no doubt
true that the system of
allowing substitutes has
been abused in a few
cases. But so long as
the emoluments attached
to most of these posts
in the Temples are what
they are, it cannot be
expected that the "baraawadar
will give up a more ~~lucra~~
lucrative appointment
elsewhere for the one
in the Temple, while

may remain vacant

G.R.S. 27]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Continuation sheet draft form.)

he is at the same time anxious not to lose his hereditary office for ever. So long as the Sumastha performs his duties satisfactorily, there is no good reason to insist upon the "karanam" for himself attending to the services in festivals. For these reasons, the order of the Dy. Commr is set aside.

Memo no 3506 Dy 18.6.
Mowg. Rs 16-15=1

11/6/18

No order may be printed.

Copy to the Dy. Commr, together with the records received with his letter no. 31 Dy & 16th Septr 1917.

B.O.
16.6.18

Joint Secretary, Revenue Deptt.

D(2) 19/5/18
19.5.18
19.5.18

W D 2684—GPB—2,000—7-4-16

Before the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

APPEAL No. 12 *OF* 1917-18.

APPELLANT. ~~RESPONDENT~~

M. A. Ramanujiengar son of
Anna Sami Tirunarayandengar.

SUBJECT.

Appeal against Deputy Commissioner's orders Nos. 924 and 925 dated 3rd April 1915 re. Archakship of Sri Pattabhirama pevaru temple at Paschimavahini, and the Ammanavara Sannidhi Parichārike of Sri Lakshminarasimha Swami temple at Seringapatam.

Decision.

The case was heard on 16th April 1918, the appellant being present in person.

The appellant is admittedly the "Hakdar" to the two appointments in question, the "baraward" standing in the name of his father. It seems scarcely fair or equitable to deprive him of his "hak" on the ground that he is not able to perform the duties appertaining to these offices himself, while allowing substitutes in a great many other cases. It is time rules were made as to what appointments, proper substitutes may be allowed for, and what not. It is no doubt true that the system of allowing substitutes has been abused in a few cases. But so long as the emoluments attached to most of these posts in the temples are what they are, it cannot be expected that the "barawardar" will give up a more lucrative appointment elsewhere for the one in the temple, while he is at the same time anxious not to lose his hereditary office for ever. So long as the gumasta performs his duties satisfactorily, there is

no good

(22

no good reason to insist upon the "barawarddar" himself attending to the services in question. For these reasons, the order of the Deputy Commissioner is set aside.

By Order,

for Joint Secretary to Government.
Mahsul Department.

.R. S. 27]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Continuation sheet draft

2065 M 3507 Mbers 416-15-5

Endorsement from to
M. A. Ramanuja Iyengar
Son of Anna Sami Tonnarna
Iyengar, Bangalore, with
ref. to his petition no 6169
Dy 9th Septr 1915 appealing
against the Dy. Commrs.
order regarding the Archakship
of Sri Pallabhi Rama Devara
Temple at Paschimavahini
and the Annamanavara
Sannidhi Paricharike of
Sri Lakshmi Nara Simha
Temple at Seringapatam.

In reply, the appellant
is informed that so long
as the Sumastha performs
the of the appointments in question
his duties, Satisfactorily,
Govt will not insist upon
the barawardar himself
attending to the services in question.

B.O.
Mk 6.18
12.6.18
Joint Secretary
and
Mys. Govt.

M.D.
29/5/18

G P B—20,000—16-2-14

Archakship of Sri Pattabhi Rama Devaru Temple at Paschimavahini and Ammanavara Sannidhi Paricharike of Sri Laksminarasimha Swami Temple at Seringapatam.

No. 3506—Muz. 416-15-4, dated 18th June 1918.

BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

Appeal No. 12 of 1917-18.

Appellant.

M. A. Ramanujiengar, son of Anna Sami Tirunaraniengai

Subject.

Appeal against Deputy Commissioner's Orders Nos. 924 and 925, dated 3rd April 1915 *re* Archakship of Sri Pattabhirama Devaru temple at Paschimavahini, and the Ammanavara Sannidhi Paricharike of Sri Lakshminarasimha Swami temple at Seringapatam.

Decision.

The case was heard on 16th April 1918, the appellant being present in person.

The appellant is admittedly the "Hakdar" to the two appointments in question the "baraward" standing in the name of his father. It seems scarcely fair or equitable to deprive him of his "hak" on the ground that he is not able to perform the duties appertaining to these offices himself, while allowing substitutes in a great many other cases. It is time rules were made as to what appointments proper substitutes may be allowed for and what not. It is no doubt true that the system of allowing substitutes has been abused in a few cases. But so long as the emoluments attached to most of these posts in the temples are what they are, it cannot be expected that the "barawarddar" will give up a more lucrative appointment elsewhere for the one in the temple, while he is at the same time anxious not to lose his hereditary office for ever. So long as the gumasta performs his duties satisfactorily, there is no good reason to insist upon the "barawarddar" himself attending to the services in question. For these reasons, the order of the Deputy Commissioner is set aside.

By Order,

G. ARAVAMUDU IYENGAR,
Joint-Secy. to Govt., Muz. Dept.

Exd.—C. R.

Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

GENERAL AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.

G. O. No. 3506—Muz. 416-15-4, dated

Archakship of Sri Pattabhi Rama Devaru Temple at Paschimavahini and Ammanavara Sannidhi Paricharike of Sri Lakshminarasimha Swami Temple at Seringapatam.

Sets aside the Deputy Commissioner's order *re* ——

W D A2501—GPB—6 7-18—105